



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,657	04/05/2001	Richard E. McNutt	ODS/035	5396

1473 7590 12/15/2005

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS FL C3
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, BINH AN DUC

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3713

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/827,657	Applicant(s) MCNUTT ET AL.	
	Examiner Binh-An D. Nguyen	Art Unit 3713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/1/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-24 and 26-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 11, 15, 19 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The request for consideration filed September 1, 2005 has been received. Currently, claims 1-28 are pending in the application, wherein claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-24, and 26-28 have been previously withdrawn due to non-elected species. Claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 19, and 25 have been examined on the merits. Acknowledgment has been made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 11, 15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stronach (6,722,980).

Referring to claims 1 and 15, Stronach teaches a method and system for recognizing a wagerer (game player) of an interactive wagering application implemented at least partially on user equipment comprising: user equipment (wagering terminal 120, Figs.2-4; 3:54-4:57, 13:66-14:19) configured for receiving racing data from a racing data provider (110, Fig.1), wherein at least a portion of the racing data originates from at least one race track where races corresponding to the racing data are being run (3:30-51; 8:23-50); allowing a wagerer to place a parimutuel wager on one of

Art Unit: 3713

the races (4:43-57); accessing a wagering history of the wagerer (4:26-57), (i.e., wagering record in wager database being used, where applicable, to signal the appropriate wagering terminal to initiate payout of winning wagers to the user); a wagering control system configured for selecting a wagerer, and determining if the wagerer is to be recognized based on the wagering history of the wagerer (4:26-57; 3:54-4:25; 5:63-6:62; 8:51-67); providing an incentive to the wagerer (game player) if the wagerer is determined to be recognized (10:66-11:14).

Referring to claims 11 and 25, Stronach teaches providing the incentive to the wagerer comprises providing a discount on wagering service, i.e., credit is a discount (10:66-11:5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stronach in view of Acres et al. (6,364,768).

Stronach teaches all limitations of claims 1, 11, 15, and 25 above. Stronach does not explicitly teach the limitation of determining if the to be recognized wagerer is a VIP (claims 5 and 19).

Acres et al., however, teaches a method and system for recognizing a wagerer (game player) of an interactive wagering application comprising: determining if the to be recognized wagerer is a VIP (8:35-61).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the player tracking system of Acres et al. to the interactive racing system and method of Stronach to provide a friendly interactive gambling environment to encourage frequent players to come back as well as attract new players thus increase profit.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 1, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued regarding claims 1 and 15 that Stronach does not teach determining if the wagerer is to be recognized based on the wagering history of the wagerer (applicant's remark, page 2, line 14 to page 3, line 8; and page 3, lines 18-28) is not persuasive. In the wagering system of Stronach, the players are recognized based on his and/or her wagering history via the players' wager database (4:32-57), i.e., the system recognized the player upon player's placing wager. Further, the system is configured to provide prize to the player upon submission of a wager (10:66-11:14). Further more, applicant's acknowledgment of Stronach's teaching of providing incentives to wagerers that are distinct from providing payouts of winning wagers

Art Unit: 3713

(applicant's remark, page 3, lines 9-17) affirms the examiner's position. Thus, Stronach clearly anticipated applicant's claimed invention.

Further, applicant's arguments regarding Stronach not teaching the limitation of determining if the wager is to be recognized..." (applicant's remark, page 3, lines 25-28) is not well taken since this limitation has not been claimed by the applicant. The applicant claimed determining if the wagerer, not the wager, is to be recognized. Furthermore, the limitation of "providing an incentive to the wagerer if the wagerer is to be recognized" does not limit the recognition of the wagerer based on the wagering history of the wagering history only. This limitation is also interpreted broadly as the system recognized the player prior to providing her/him the incentive or prize.

Applicant's argument regarding rejection to claims 11 and 25 (applicant's remark, page 4, third paragraph) is deemed not to be persuasive. Stronach teaches all limitations of claims 1 and 15 as being addressed above. Further, Stronach teaches providing the incentive to the wagerer comprises providing a discount on wagering service, i.e., credit is a discount (10:66-11:5).

Applicant's argument regarding rejection to claims 5 and 19 (applicant's remark, page 4, last two paragraphs) is deemed not to be persuasive. Since Stronach anticipated all limitations of claims 1, 11, 5, and 25 as being addressed above; and further, Acres et al. teaches a method and system for recognizing a wagerer (game player) of an interactive wagering application comprising: determining if the to be recognized wagerer is a VIP (8:35-61). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the player

tracking system of Acres et al. to the interactive racing system and method of Stronach to provide a friendly interactive gambling environment to encourage frequent players to come back as well as attract new players thus increase profit.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh-An D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BN



XUAN M. THAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 3700